

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE WILLIAM J. PERRY  
REMARKS EN ROUTE TO OTTAWA, CANADA  
MAY 16, 1994

Q. Do you have anything new on North Korea?

A. No.

Q. Are you prepared to pretty quickly move -- you've made clear that since North Korea says that if you declare sanctions that they've said they'd consider that an act of war. Are you prepared to beef up forces rapidly if sanctions are declared?

A. We have a number of contingency steps we're prepared to take that improve our readiness. The words "beef up forces" doesn't quite capture what we're doing. It's not necessarily adding more troops to Korea. It's improving the readiness to reinforce rapidly. That is the essence.

Q. So you would not necessarily send more troops?

A. Not necessarily.

Q. How about Canada? Are you confident that they're going to allow you to continue to cruise missile test? Cooperate on that and on NORAD?

A. I'm not even going to ask them to continue the cruise missile testing. We've done all the tests that we had scheduled to do in the foreseeable future. That may be an issue on their side. It's not an issue on our side.

Q. So there are no more tests scheduled?

A. Not in the foreseeable future.

Q. How about NORAD? What about defense cuts?

A. NORAD we're going to -- we have started a joint review, Canadian/U.S. review. Originally that was scheduled -- the decisions on the follow-on to NORAD would be done in '96. We're accelerating that to make it coterminous with the parliamentary review they're conducting of their whole defense. Because it's a big part of the U.S./Canadian joint defense effort, so we're changing the timing of this, as I say, accelerating it, so it's more compatible with their timing, their planning.

Q. Their defense budget is tiny compared to ours -- right? About \$8 1/2 billion -- less than \$9 billion. Is this a big chunk out of their defense budget for NORAD?

A. It is. I can't give you the dollar figure or the percentage but it is both from an economic and from a perception point of view, and certainly it's a very big part of our cooperative program. It's the lynch pin of the cooperative program that we have with Canada.

Q. Is it still relevant? Now that the Cold War is dead?

A. It's relevant as long as both countries want to maintain the sovereign rights to protect their air space against intrusions. We certainly want to do that and I believe Canada does too. Setting the Cold War aside all together, every country has some responsibility to protect their air space from intrusion. When you have as big and complicated a region to defend as the United States and Canada, in other words, North America, then it takes a pretty big, complex system to do that. That system was put in place for Cold War purposes, but it's very well suited for protecting sovereign rights against intrusion.

Q. Need it be as big and extensive as it is now given the fact that a massive missile attack or an air attack over the polar cap is unlikely now?

A. Certainly the study that's underway right now will consider what the requirements are likely to be in the future as opposed to what they've been in the past. I would not be surprised to see some downsizing of NORAD resulting.

Q. How about issues of peacekeeping, Mr. Secretary? Are you going to be discussing with them about the arms embargo, their role on the ground in Bosnia versus the fact that we don't have anybody on the ground. Is that going to be part of their whole exchange?

A. We're certainly going to discuss Bosnia in particular and peacekeeping in general. The Canadians have had a very strong record in peacekeeping through the years. We have some things we can learn from what they've been doing in peacekeeping. In the case of Bosnia, we have mutual interests in bringing that war to a conclusion, to reach a peace agreement. They're playing an important role in that so we'll have a lot to say about that.

Q. Will you be trying to get them to endorse -- I guess their foreign minister came out and said that they would oppose any kind of unilateral move to lift the embargo which was the issue that the Senate took up last week. What would your message to them be on that subject?

A. Nearly all of the forces if not all of the countries that have forces on the ground in Bosnia have been opposed to the unilateral lifting of the embargo.

Q. Which the administration has as well?

A. Yes. I think we have very little to discuss there. We're in agreement.

Q. Canada has also made it pretty clear that they would oppose any military intervention, invasion of Haiti. I think they made that clear after Albright's visit last week, the week

before last -- do you intend to ask them about taking part in peacekeeping after we (inaudible) military force?

A. Yes, I intend to discuss with them what kind of police forces or peacekeeping forces they might be willing to provide after such time as the military dictatorship there has relinquished their power. I do not plan to discuss with them any aspects of military intervention in Haiti, only the peacekeeping aspect.

Q. Do you see any move on the part of the Haitian military to give up the ship so to speak and back away?

A. We're starting to get some signals from Haiti, but it's very difficult to interpret just what these signals mean. Cedras -- the President, for example, indicating that Cedras might be willing to step down. I don't want to even try to interpret what that sort of a signal means. We're seeing a number of signals like that which suggest that they realize they're in a very precarious position there and are looking for some way of changing their situation, improving their situation.

Thank you very much.